

EXHIBIT B

1/16/10 Email from G. West, to R. Wicks et al., Latham & Watkins, and R. Walden et al., JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A.

[REDACTED]

From: West, Glenn [gdwest@weil.com]

Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 6:46 PM

To: Leblanc, Andrew

Subject: FW: Project Homerun - Status Update; Strictly Confidential (CRITICAL THAT NO BIDDER SEE THIS)

status update after we missed Jan. 15 deadline set by MLB

U.S. Internal Revenue Service (IRS) Circular 230 Notice: To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that any U.S. tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties under the U.S. Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

* * *

Glenn D. West
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
Dallas Direct: 214.746.7780
NY Direct: 212.310.8033
Dallas Fax: 214.746.7777
NY Fax: 212.310.6717
Cellular: 214.215.4813
email: gdwest@weil.com

From: West, Glenn

Sent: Saturday, January 16, 2010 11:50 AM

To: Ronan.Wicks@lw.com; David.Teh@lw.com

Cc: Robert.Kao@lw.com; Sarah.Mullin@lw.com; Brown, Brandye; Price Brown, Mandisa; Thorstad, Brett; richard.walden@jpmorgan.com; kcofsky@pwpartners.com; mkramer@pwpartners.com; naomi.c.hung@jpmorgan.com; John.McDonagh@chase.com; mcauz@mgbd.com; Casey Coffman; Thomas Hicks; sheldon.stein@baml.com; Brandon W. Gardner

Subject: Project Homerun - Status Update; Strictly Confidential (CRITICAL THAT NO BIDDER SEE THIS)

We are now past the January 15th deadline imposed by MLB and we have significant unresolved issues on the Greenberg APA, although both sides have worked very hard to get it done. The efforts on the Greenberg side have been very cooperative and collaborative since they arrived here last Sunday; and there has been no lack of effort by either side. But, despite all efforts, the gap between the economics on the Greenberg proposal and the Crane proposal remain very wide. It is unlikely we can recommend that we proceed forward with Greenberg based on where we are with their proposal and assuming we can proceed forward with Crane. It is not clear to me that any additional amount of time is going to further narrow the gap between Greenberg and Crane. And we are quite worried that if we don't move to Crane immediately we will lose them completely since they are very unhappy we have been negotiating with Greenberg and letting the Crane's proposal be, in their words, a "stalking horse." Just to update you:

1. Greenberg is still at _____ cash (before payment of overdraft facility, MLB support, advisor fees and closing costs), which is down from the original bid of: _____, with a \$30 million escrow/cap (which is fortunately lower than the original request of \$75 million) to cover post closing indemnification claims. But they have significantly increased the risk that the escrow would be actually used to cover these claims by eliminating materiality as a standard for determining whether reps have been breached.

2. They have now requested a full week of diligence after signing, with a complete walk right, which effectively allows a renegotiation after we are committed to their deal. In fairness, this request results from the significant additional documents their expanded representations required to be listed on the schedules and the fact that

intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by email (postmaster@weil.com), and destroy the original message. Thank you.